

SMX 3108.1 (98-14CIP4)  
PATENT**REMARKS****Objections to Claims 35 and 63**

In Amendment A, filed on August 12, 2004, Applicants responded to an objection that claim 35 did not further limit the subject matter of claim 1. In responding to the objection, Applicants' mistakenly characterized the scope of claim 35 more narrowly than the language of claim 35 requires. In particular, Applicants stated that "claim 1 only requires that the four or more reaction vessels be semi-continuous OR continuous, whereas claim 35 requires that the reaction vessels comprise semi-continuous flow reaction vessels, thereby excluding any continuous reactors." (emphasis altered herein). This characterization that continuous-flow reaction vessels are "excluded" from the scope of claim 35 is incorrect. Rather, claim 35 defines over claim 1 by requiring that the reactor comprise semi-continuous flow reaction vessels, while permitting the reactor to additionally comprise continuous-flow reaction vessels, as defined by claim 1. In other words, the reactor of claim 1 may include (i) all continuous-flow reaction vessels, (ii) all semi-continuous flow reaction vessels, or (iii) one or more semi-continuous flow reaction vessels combined with one or more continuous-flow reaction vessels. In contrast, the reactor of claim 35 may comprise (ii) all semi-continuous flow reaction vessels, or (iii) one or more semi-continuous flow reaction vessels combined with one or more continuous-flow reaction vessels; but claim 35 may not comprise (i) all continuous-flow reaction vessels.

Thus, claim 35 further defines the subject matter of claim 1 by excluding a reactor with all continuous-flow reaction vessels. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection of claim 35.

Similarly, Applicants mistakenly characterized the scope of claim 63 more narrowly than the language of claim 63 requires. The characterization that continuous-flow reaction vessels are "excluded" from the scope of claim 63 is incorrect. Rather, claim 63 defines over claims 58, 59, 60, and 61 by requiring that the reactor comprise semi-continuous flow reaction vessels, while permitting the reactor to additionally comprise continuous-flow reaction vessels, as defined by claims 58, 59, 60, and 61. Continuous-flow reaction vessels are not required, but are permitted by claim 63, like claim 35. Thus, claim 63 further defines the subject matter of claims 58, 59, 60, and 61 by excluding a reactor with all continuous-flow reaction vessels. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection of claim 63.

SMX 3108.1 (98-14CIP4)  
PATENT

Conclusion

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any under payment to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian P. Klein, Reg. No. 44,837  
SENNIGER POWERS  
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
(314) 231-5400

BPK/dss

VIA FACSIMILE 703-872-9306